



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MONUMENT OF ANCYRA

IT is a remarkable tribute to the constructive statesmanship of Augustus Caesar that historians and political theorists still disagree when they attempt to classify and label the political organization which he gave to the Roman state. It has been variously named an empire, a dyarchy, or a principate. The second of these terms was coined by Mommsen to apply to this political institution alone. The third is applied to no imperial organization other than the Roman empire. Augustus himself proudly states that, after he had gained complete power by the consent of all classes, he handed over the republic out of his own control to the decision of the senate and the Roman people.<sup>1</sup> With a fine skill in ambiguity and tactful phrase, he avoids the bald statement that he gave back the commonwealth to the senate and Roman people. He does not mention at this point the powers which the senate and people bestowed upon him after he had put an end to his anomalous position in 27 B. C. Also, naturally enough, he does not draw the sum of those powers. He emphasizes instead the separate offices which he held and says that he had no more power than those who were his colleagues in any magistracy. The statement is far from true, however true or false it may have seemed to the careful diplomat who wrote the words. For the separate powers, when massed, gave Augustus complete control of the state; and the sum of his powers made each separate office more significant.

In the years 28 and 27 B. C., and those immediately following, the phrase "restoration of the liberties of the Roman people" was the legend of coins and inscriptions. In these years the idea of the "restituta res publica" was advanced, which is found in the *Fasti* of Ovid, in the Praenestian *Fasti* and other inscriptions, and in Velleius Paterculus.<sup>2</sup> But Strabo, writing in the years 18 and 19

<sup>1</sup> *Res Gestae*, ch. 34.

<sup>2</sup> See Mommsen, *Res Gestae*, pp. 145-146.

A. D., plainly saw that "the fatherland turned over to him [Augustus] the leadership of the government and he became master of war and peace for life".<sup>3</sup>

In writing the *Res Gestae*, Augustus employed the phrase "res publica" when dealing with the civil wars and the time of the triumvirate,<sup>4</sup> and in chapter 34 where he states that he handed over the republic to the decision of the senate and Roman people. In the enumeration of all deeds and honors occurring after that period, the term "res publica" is not found in the *Res Gestae*. Does this merely happen so? I think not. There must have been but few men in the Roman senate when Augustus composed the *Res Gestae* or at the time of his death who did not realize and acknowledge the enormous scope of the constitutional powers which had been so deftly gathered into the hands of this great politician. These contemporaries of Strabo would have smiled, some of them grimly, if Augustus toward the end of his life had tried to insist upon the idea of the restoration of the republic. That there was another reason more potent and important, why the idea of the republic should be suppressed, is the thesis of this paper.

Another testimonial to the inscrutable diplomacy of the man who constructed the Roman empire out of the old timbers of the republic, is the document which was found on the walls of the temple of Augustus at Ancyra. The different attempts to bring this document under some specific literary class or type have not been entirely successful. Ernest Bormann has insisted that it was an epitaph.<sup>5</sup> But he has been forced to the admission that the person and the circumstances concerned were both unique, in order to explain the great divergence of this inscription from other epitaphs. He is also forced to the problematic statement that the document, published as it was after Augustus's death, may have been carried out in quite a different fashion from that expected by its author.<sup>6</sup> This interpretation of the Monument of Ancyra found ardent supporters in Johannes Schmidt<sup>7</sup> and H. Nissen.<sup>8</sup> Among the names of eminent scholars who have opposed this view are those of Otto Hirschfeld,<sup>9</sup> Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff,<sup>10</sup> and Theodor Mommsen.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo, XVII. 3, 25, p. 840. Cf. Niese, *Hermes*, XIII. 33-36.

<sup>4</sup> *Res Gestae*, chs. 1 and 25.

<sup>5</sup> In *Bemerkungen zum Schriftlichen Nachlasse des Kaisers Augustus* (Universitäts-Einladung, Marburg, 1884).

<sup>6</sup> *Verhandlungen der drei und vierzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Köln* (1895), p. 181.

<sup>7</sup> Johannes Schmidt in articles published in *Philologus*, vols. XLIV., XLV., XLVI.

<sup>8</sup> H. Nissen in *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. XLI. (1886).

<sup>9</sup> *Wiener Studien*, VII. 170-174 (1885).

<sup>10</sup> *Hermes*, XXI. 623-627 (1886).

sen.<sup>11</sup> Wilamowitz was the first to point out that it was scarcely fitting that the epitaph of Augustus, the man, should be inscribed upon the temple of Augustus, the god, at Ancyra. If, however, the people of his day regarded this document as the summary of the "*res gestae divi Augusti*", its position upon the walls of the temple was entirely proper. Wilamowitz also pointed out that Hadrian had set up, in the Pantheon which he built at Athens, an inscription modelled upon the *Res Gestae* inscription of Augustus.<sup>12</sup> In this document Hadrian published for posterity, as Augustus had done, some of his wars, the temples he had built or adorned, and his gifts to cities both Greek and barbarian. Similar as it was to the *Res Gestae*, the Hadrian inscription can in no way be regarded as an epitaph; and the fact that Augustus caused the account of his deeds to be set up before his mausoleum does not necessitate the conclusion that it was a grave inscription.

The matter of the name to be applied to the Monument of Ancyra is relatively of small importance. The name given to it upon the temple of Ancyra—"rerum gestarum divi Augusti exemplar"—was satisfactory to the imperial subjects in Asia Minor, and the term *Res Gestae* adopted by Mommsen described it fairly well.<sup>13</sup> The question of its content and purpose is the real historical problem. The idea of Wilamowitz that its chief purpose was to be a justification of the apotheosis of Augustus has not obtained credence. Wölfflin's belief that it was the balance-sheet drawn by the founder of the monarchy is almost equally inadequate.<sup>14</sup> Mommsen in his summary, which practically ended the protracted discussion, regarded the *Res Gestae* as the sum of his fifty years' rule drawn by the founder of the empire and set before the public.<sup>15</sup> He further states that, in his opinion, Augustus must have had a distinct political motive in bringing out this singular publication in his testament in the place and manner in which it appeared. What this political motive was Mommsen did not profess to know.<sup>16</sup>

One peculiarity of the *Res Gestae* has often been noticed, namely, that Augustus does not mention the names of any of his opponents in the civil wars, nor the names of his father and mother, not

<sup>11</sup> Mommsen's article in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LVII. (Neue Folge XXI.) 385-397 (1887), is a remarkably clean-cut piece of analysis and an unanswerable summary of this phase of the discussion.

<sup>12</sup> See Pausanias, I. 5, 5.

<sup>13</sup> Mommsen believed that the title "*Index Rerum a se Gestarum*" must have been used by Augustus himself in the orders which he left for its publication. See *Historische Zeitschrift*, LVII. 392.

<sup>14</sup> E. Wölfflin, *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-phil. und hist. Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1886, pp. 253-282.

<sup>15</sup> *Historische Zeitschrift*, LVII. 390.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 395.

even his own name, excepting where the statement is made that the senate gave him the honorary title of Augustus.<sup>17</sup> This peculiarity forced itself upon my attention in a different light as one of the most characteristic features of the *Res Gestae*. Foreign kings with whom the generals of Augustus fought, those who came to him as suppliants, and those set up by Augustus upon the Parthian and Median thrones are mentioned by name.<sup>18</sup> The names of the Roman consuls are of course used to designate the year. Apart from these there are no names actually given other than those of members of Augustus's family, with one exception. This is in chapter 12: "By a decree of the senate, at the same time a part of the praetors and tribunes of the people with the consul Quintus Lucretius and leading citizens were sent into Campania to meet me, an honor which up to this time has been decreed to no one but me." The reason for mentioning the name of Quintus Lucretius is clear. In the foregoing chapter the consuls of the year, Quintus Lucretius and Marcus Vinicius, were given, as usual, by name. The name of the consul Lucretius in the following chapter does not therefore interfere with the apparent policy of suppressing the names of all but members of the family of Caesar. In fact it would be noticeable, seeing that the two names had just been given, if the name of the one consul who went to meet Augustus should not be stated.

It is therefore safe to say that the omission of proper names in the *Res Gestae* except in the case of members of the family is a policy which Augustus pursued consciously and with a purpose. In order to determine the reason behind that policy, it is necessary to examine more closely the members of the family whose names are suggested and those actually given. The passages in which the family of Augustus appear without direct statement of names are:

Ch. 2: Qui parentem meum interfecerunt eos in exilium expuli.<sup>19</sup>

Ch. 10: Pontifex maximus ne fierem in vivi conlegae locum, populo id sacerdotium deferente mihi, quod pater meus habuit, recusavi.

Ch. 19: Porticum . . . quam sum appellari passus ex nomine eius qui priorem eodem in solo fecerat Octaviam.

The earlier portico was built by Gnaeus Octavius in 165 B. C.<sup>20</sup>

Ch. 20: Forum Iulium et basilicam, quae fuit inter aedem Castoris et aedem Saturni, coepta profligataque opera a patre meo perfeci et eandem basilicam consumptam incendio ampliatio eius solo sub titulo nominis filiorum meorum incohavi et, si vivus non perfecissem, perfici ab heredibus iussi.

<sup>17</sup> See Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, I. 1285.

<sup>18</sup> See *Res Gestae*, chs. 27, 32, 33.

<sup>19</sup> Had Augustus desired to justify his apotheosis, as Wilamowitz supposed, he would certainly have used here the usual phrase, *divum Iulium*, instead of *parentem meum*.

<sup>20</sup> See Festus, p. 78, quoted in Mommsen, *Res Gestae*, p. 80.

Ch. 22: Ter munus gladiatorium dedi meo nomine et quinquens filiorum meorum aut nepotum nomine.

The sons were, of course, Lucius and Gaius Caesar. The grandsons were Germanicus, nephew and adopted son of Tiberius, and Drusus, son of Tiberius.

Ch. 22: Bis athletarum undique accitorum spectaclum populo prae bui meo nomine et tertium nepotis mei nomine.

Ch. 22: Venationes bestiarum Africanarum meo nomine aut filiorum meorum et nepotum in circo aut in foro aut in amphitheatris populo dedi sexiens et viciens.

It is evident that Augustus desired during his lifetime to keep the names of the male members of the imperial family before the people and made use of the public spectacles for that purpose. When he wrote the *Res Gestae*, it seemed advisable for some reason to recall these benefactions and the fact that they were given by the Princeps acting in the name of members of his household. Augustus wrote this proud and simple record of his deeds with the feeling that posterity might thereby appreciate more fully his life of toil and devotion. Why then is he so careful to record the fact that these things were done in the name of sons or grandsons? Clearly he wished to lay emphasis upon these spectacles as coming not from himself alone, but from himself as head of the imperial family. As surely as there was some definite reason for this course when he celebrated the games, just so surely there was a reason for recalling the fact when he composed the *Res Gestae*.

In the following places the names of members of the imperial family are actually given:

Ch. 8: In consulatu sexto censem populi conlega M. Agrippa egi.

Ch. 8: Tertium consulari cum imperio lustrum conlega Tib. Caesare filio feci, Sex. Pompeio et Sex. Appuleio cos.

Ch. 14: Filios meos, quos iuvenes mihi eripuit fortuna, Gaium et Lucium Caesares, honoris mei causa senatus populusque Romanus annum quintum et decimum agentis consules designavit.

Ch. 21: Theatrum ad aede Apollinis in solo magna ex parte a privatis empto feci, quod sub nomine M. Marcelli generi mei esset.

Ch. 22: Pro conlegio XV virorum magister conlegi collega M. Agrippa ludos saeculares . . . feci.

Ch. 27: Armeniam maiorem interfecto rege eius Artaxe cum possem facere provinciam, malui maiorum nostrorum exemplo regnum id Tigrani regis Artavasdis filio . . . per Ti. Neronem tradere, qui tum mihi privignus erat. Et eandem gentem postea desciscentem et rebellantem domitam per Gaium filium meum regi Ariobarzani regis Medorum Artabazi filio regendam tradidi.

Ch. 30: Pannoniorum gentes, quas ante me principem populi Romani exercitus numquam adit, devictas per Ti. Neronem, qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus, imperio populi Romani subieci.

The names which occur are, Marcus Agrippa, mentioned twice; Gaius and Lucius Caesar mentioned together in one place; Gaius Caesar mentioned once alone; Marcus Marcellus, mentioned once; Tiberius Nero, mentioned three times. These five men of the imperial household are the very ones who at one time or another during the long reign of Augustus were groomed by him and marked as the successors to his powers. No others came into consideration for the imperial succession and no others are mentioned in the *Res Gestae*. It seems, therefore, that Augustus when writing the *Res Gestae* was preparing the way for the succession in his family, just as during his principate he had prepared, one after the other, Agrippa, Marcellus, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, and finally Tiberius, for the great task. As he had prepared the Roman people for the succession, as well as these princes, by pushing them wherever possible into prominent and responsible positions, so he reminds a later generation unostentatiously of the work done at his side by Agrippa, of the young Marcellus, of the honors bestowed upon the two young Caesars, and of the faithful labors of Tiberius Nero in behalf of the state.

The passage (chapter 14) in which Augustus recalls the honors granted to Gaius and Lucius Caesar is especially significant. It occurs in the last chapter of the general division of the *Res Gestae* which recounts the "honores" of Augustus. The statement is that the senate and Roman people designated these youths as consuls in their fifteenth year, "honoris mei causa"; that they were permitted to be present at the deliberations of the senate from the day upon which they assumed the toga virilis; and that they were called *principes iuventutis*. It seems a curious anticlimax, coming at the end of the long list of honors and offices granted to Caesar. Did these unusual privileges and attentions bestowed upon his two adopted sons really reflect so much glory upon the man who had been admitted to the senate and had been elected consul in his twentieth year,<sup>21</sup> who had been chosen *triumvir rei publicae constituendae* in his twenty-first year, who had declined many triumphs and even the dictatorship?<sup>22</sup> Evidently the honors paid to Augustus were, according to the impression he would leave, honors paid to his family, and the honors of his family were honors bestowed equally upon him. Thus the idea of the family and consequently the idea of the inheritance are tactfully suggested in the chapter devoted to the young Caesars.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup> *Res Gestae*, ch. 1.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, chs. 4 and 5.

<sup>23</sup> This fact did not escape Nissen. *Rheinisches Museum*, XLI. 487 (1886): "Die Nennung des Tiberius, des Gaius, namentlich das 14. Kapitel von der Erhe-

Stranger even than the emphasis upon the extraordinary position of the two *principes iuventutis* is the peculiar choice made by Augustus in publishing the names of his generals in the *Res Gestae*. The name of Tiberius appears in connection with the Armenian campaign of 22 B. C.<sup>24</sup> Gaius Caesar is mentioned in connection with the Armenian campaign of the year 2 A. D.<sup>25</sup> Tiberius is again mentioned by name (in chapter 30) for his victories over the Pannonians in the years 12–10 B. C. Note that in each case the relationship with the Princeps is especially emphasized: “per Ti. Neronem, qui tum mihi privignus erat; per Gaium filium meum; per Ti. Neronem qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus”. Compare also the mention of Marcellus’s name in chapter 21: “sub nomine M. Marcelli generi mei”.

The motive which dictates to Augustus what names among his generals are to be mentioned is easily apparent. They are surely not selected on a basis of the value of their services to the state and the Princeps, nor because of the importance of their victories. The well-conducted though fruitless campaigns of Gaius Aelius Gallus in Arabia in the years 25 and 24 B. C., and the brilliant work of Gaius Petronius in Aethiopia in 24 and 23 B. C., receive the following comment:<sup>26</sup> “Meo iussu et auspicio ducti sunt duo exercitus eodem fere tempore in Aethiopiam et in Arabiam . . . maximaeque hostium gentis utriusque copiae caesae sunt in acie et complura oppida capta. In Aethiopiam usque ad oppidum Nabata perventum est, cui proxima est Meroë. In Arabiam usque in fines Sabaeorum processit exercitus ad oppidum Mariba.” In neither case is the name of the general given, although Petronius won the position of prefect of Egypt as a reward for his success. Marcus Licinius Crassus suppressed the dangerous uprisings of the Dacians in the years 29–28 B. C., and was awarded a triumph in 27 B. C., for his able conduct of the war. His name does not appear in Augustus’s statement of this outbreak.<sup>27</sup> The name of Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus does not occur in the account of the Dacian wars although he earned the honor of a triumph for his service against the Dacians in the years 5–7 A. D.<sup>28</sup>

Still more noticeable than the omission of these names is the

bung des Gaius und Lucius Caesar zu principes iuventutis hängt mit dem dynastischen Endziel seiner Politik zusammen; in den Söhnen wird der Vater geehrt; in seinem Sinne erbt das ihm geschenkte und so glänzend gerechtfertigte Vertrauen von selbst auf die Söhne fort.”

<sup>24</sup> *Res Gestae*, ch. 27.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 26. Cf. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, vol. I., book VIII., ch. 1.

<sup>27</sup> *Res Gestae*, ch. 30.

<sup>28</sup> See Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, second ed., pp. 131–132.



fact that Drusus's name does not appear in the *Res Gestae*. He was a great favorite of Augustus and equally beloved by the Roman populace and the soldiers who served under him.<sup>29</sup> His brilliant success in conquering Germany from the Rhine to the Elbe in the years 11-9 B. C. must have won the admiration of the Princeps and aroused the enthusiasm of his people. Yet no further notice is taken of this work in the *Res Gestae* than is contained in the words: "Gallias et Hispanias provincias et Germaniam qua includit oceanus a Gadibus ad ostium Albis fluminis pacavi".<sup>30</sup>

Why should the campaigns of Drusus be passed over in this fashion and the doubtful successes of Gaius Caesar in Armenia be given with mention of his name, when Gaius left his work half finished and set out for Rome disillusioned and disheartened?<sup>31</sup> I see no other possible explanation for these facts than the one already suggested, that Augustus was intent upon recalling to the minds of the senate and the Roman populace those names which would emphasize the idea of the inheritance of the powers of the Princeps.<sup>32</sup> In this light the reason becomes clear why Augustus refrained from referring to the state as *res publica* in dealing with all events which occurred after 27 B. C. It is to be found in the fact that he was endeavoring to perpetuate his absolute control in the person of his stepson, Tiberius, and the old diplomat was far too keen to mention the words *res publica*, where it could be avoided, in a document intended for publication at the critical time when the matter of the succession was being decided.

The question arises whether the conditions at Rome during the last years of Augustus's life were such as to demand this indirect method of suggesting the inheritance of the power by Tiberius, who especially comes into consideration at the time when the *Res Gestae* took its final form. Furthermore, was the document published in such a manner as to further the interests of Tiberius? There can be no doubt that the uncertainty of the succession was the one great weakness in the singular state-form constructed by

<sup>29</sup> Suetonius, *Claudius*, 1; Horace, *Odes*, IV. 14; Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, I. 1040.

<sup>30</sup> *Res Gestae*, ch. 26. The campaign of Tiberius and Drusus against the Rhaeti and Vindelici in 15 B. C. might have been mentioned separately here, but the name of Tiberius could not well be given without that of Drusus. For this reason the campaign does not receive separate notice.

<sup>31</sup> See Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, I. 1144.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. E. Kornemann, "Zum Monumentum Ancyranum", in *Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte*, 1902, p. 153. The idea that the inheritance was in Augustus's mind when he wrote the *Res Gestae* is not a new one, as is shown by the following words of Kornemann: "Mit dem eignen Ruhm auf diesem Gebiet [d. h. der Kriegsthaten] liess sich aber jetzt der Ruhm der präsumptiven Nachfolger verkünden und damit der Dauer der neuen Ordnung ein Dienst erwiesen". In my opinion, however, the importance of this fact has either passed unnoticed or has been greatly underestimated.

Augustus Caesar. Theoretically the republic still existed and the accumulated powers held by the Princeps were held only temporarily. The extraordinary powers granted to Tiberius during the life of Augustus, including the tribunician and proconsular powers, were only bestowed upon him for periods of five or ten years at a time. The history of the first century repeatedly showed this great weakness of an uncertain succession to the imperial powers. Notably was this true at the accession of Claudius, in the year of the civil wars, and again at Nerva's accession. Augustus knew this weakness; but after he had once entered upon the great game of allowing the senate its share in the power, he was compelled to play the game steadily and consistently to the end. He sought to bridge over this difficulty by preparing a successor from his family whose training and prominence would insure him the same grants of power as Augustus had enjoyed. Gardthausen has correctly pointed out that the decision between the republic and the monarchy would be made at the crisis which must necessarily ensue upon the death of the founder of the empire,<sup>33</sup> when a precedent would be established which would practically be a rule.

In its general aspects, therefore, the succession was the one thing which must have occasioned Augustus anxiety, since there can be no doubt that he wished to establish the principle of inheritance. The question then arises: Were there specific conditions in relation to Tiberius, which complicated the situation and made it necessary for such careful advancement of the family idea and the claims of Tiberius as I have indicated? Tiberius was not a man who could attract and hold popularity with the crowd. The verses quoted by Suetonius,<sup>34</sup> which ran through the streets of Rome, testify to the popular dislike of the dour prince. Augustus himself felt uncomfortable in the presence of Tiberius<sup>35</sup> and felt constrained to explain his unpopularity before the senate by attributing it to his peculiar disposition.<sup>36</sup> The accession of Tiberius was by no means unquestioned. Suetonius narrates the plot of a slave of the young Agrippa against Tiberius's life, the attempted coup d'état of L. Scribonius Libo, and the revolts of the armies in Illyricum and in Germany all occurring at that time.<sup>37</sup> Tacitus has imagined and painted the heart and thought of the city of Rome at the time of Augustus's death with his usual keen insight and dramatic skill.<sup>38</sup> In his analysis

<sup>33</sup> Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, I. 533.

<sup>34</sup> Suetonius, *Tiberius*, ch. 29.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 21.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 68; Tacitus, *Annals*, I. 10, 7.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 25.

<sup>38</sup> Tacitus, *Annals*, I. 4-8.

of the situation, the chief cause of fear on the part of Tiberius lay in the attitude of Germanicus who was then in command of the legions along the Rhine.<sup>39</sup> Indeed these mutinous legions, if Tacitus may be trusted, offered to support Germanicus in case he would consent to strike for the imperial powers.<sup>40</sup> To the fidelity of Germanicus at this critical stage Tiberius surely owed his deepest gratitude. Whether Augustus foresaw the possibility of an attempt to invest Germanicus with the imperial offices or not, the omission of Drusus's name from the account of the deeds, and that of Germanicus as well, helped to clear the decks, at least in the senate, for Tiberius's accession.

Tiberius aptly expressed his feeling of insecurity at this critical stage when he said that he felt as though he had a wolf by the ears. His desire to have the office thrust upon him became patent to the senate itself and wearied some of its members. Yet this play seemed necessary, since the powers already granted him through the influence of Augustus were in theory still regarded as extraordinary; and the situation demanded that he should say that he hoped at some time to lay down the burden placed upon him.<sup>41</sup>

The list of documents written by Augustus, in which the *Res Gestae* were included, had been deposited by the Princeps with the Vestal Virgins sixteen months before his death. They consisted of the will and three other documents. The first of the group of three contained the orders in regard to his funeral, the second was the *Res Gestae*, the third a summary of the military and financial condition of the empire. These three documents were read before the senate by Drusus,<sup>42</sup> son of Tiberius, in the first meeting held after the death of Augustus. No action had as yet been taken in regard to conferring the powers upon Tiberius. It seems evident, therefore, that the publication of the deeds of Augustus at that particular time and place was decided by the needs of the situation. Augustus reckoned upon its effect upon the senate. He could not consistently name his successor. He could, however, make use of the account of his deeds to justify the inheritance of power in his family and influence the senate's opinion in favor of Tiberius. In like manner the publication of the document before the mausoleum of Augustus would, as the aged Princeps no doubt hoped, accustom the people of Rome to the idea of the inherited monarchy.

It would be folly to assert that this purpose was the sole or even the most important one which animated Augustus in writing the

<sup>39</sup> Tacitus, *Annals*, I. 7, 9.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 35, 3.

<sup>41</sup> Suetonius, *Tiberius*, ch. 24.

<sup>42</sup> Suetonius, *Augustus*, ch. 101, and *Tiberius*, ch. 23.

*Res Gestae*. My only claim is that this political motive was in his mind when he wrote the document and that it played a considerable part in the composition and in the manner of publication of the *Res Gestae*.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>43</sup> I have reserved for another time the attempt to square the results of this investigation with Kornemann's contention in regard to the time of composition of the different parts of the *Res Gestae*. In general it may be said that the conditions which demanded emphasis upon the idea of the inheritance remained the same throughout Augustus's principate. Therefore the results of the paper are not affected if one accepts Kornemann's conclusion that the final revision by Augustus occurred in 6 A.D. See Kornemann in *Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte*, vols. II., III., IV., V.

W. L. WESTERMANN.